

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated Dec. 8, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,864 ("O'Neil") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,970,719 ("McConnell"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims in light of the following remarks.

### II. The References Fail to Teach Initiating a First Call to a Wireless Extension of a Centrix Line and a Second Call to the Centrix Line

Independent claims 1 and 5 recite initiating a first call to ***a wireless extension*** of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach at least this element.

O'Neil is directed to a method and system for automatically connecting telephone calls to multiple devices having different directory numbers. In O'Neil, a subscriber may associate a telephone number of a wireless device with a telephone number of a wireline number so that when a call is placed to the wireline number, a first call may be initiated to the wireless device and a second call may be initiated to the wireline number. The Examiner has admitted that O'Neil fails to teach a Centrix line. O'Neil additionally fails to teach initiating a call to a wireline number and initiating another call to ***a wireless extension*** of the wireline number. In O'Neil, the telephone number of the wireless device is not ***a wireless extension*** of the wireline number, but is simply a separate telephone number of a wireless device that a user has associated with the wireline number. Thus, O'Neil necessarily does not disclose initiating a first call to ***a wireless extension*** of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line.

Like O'Neil, McConnell also fails to teach initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line. McConnell is directed to a private wireless network integrated with a public wireless network. In McConnell, a mobile device may be used as a cellular phone when outside a private network wireless coverage, and be used as an extension of a Centrix line when within the private network wireless coverage. However, McConnell does not teach dual ringing such that when a

telephone call is placed to a Centrix line, a service node initiates a first call to a wireless extension of the Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line. In McConnell, a call is only initiated to the mobile device. Therefore, while McConnell may teach a mobile device that may act as an extension of a Centrix line, McConnell fails to teach initiating a first call to *a wireless extension* of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line.

Because O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach at least initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claims 1 and 5, or any claims that depends on claims 1 and 5, unpatentable.

### **III. The Proposed Combination Does Not Render Claim 15 Unpatentable**

Independent claim 15 recites a service node coupled with a service signal point, the service node operative to initiate a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line in response to the wireless extension of the Centrix line being available. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach a service node initiating a first call to a wireless extension of a Centrix line and a second call to the Centrix line. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claim 15, or any claim that depends on claim 15, unpatentable.


### **IV. The Proposed Combination Does Not Render Claim 18 Unpatentable**

Independent claim 18 recites initiating a call to a Centrix line and initiating a call to a wireless extension of the Centrix line. O'Neil and McConnell both fail to teach this element. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of O'Neil and McConnell necessarily does not render independent claim 18, or any claim that depends on claim 18, unpatentable.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott W. Brim", is written over a horizontal line.

Scott W. Brim  
Registration No. 51,500  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200